DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 334 153 SP 033 085

AUTHOR Macias, Reynaldo F.
TITLE The National Need for Bilingual Teachers. Executive Summary.
INSTITUTION Tomas Rivera Center, Claremont, CA.
SPONS AGENCY EXXON Education Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 9p.
AVAILABLE FROM Tomas Rivera Center, 710 North College Ave., Claremont, CA 91711.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education; *Bilingual Teachers; Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; Limited English Speaking; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Second Language Instruction; Staff Development; Teacher Recruitment; *Teacher Supply and Demand

ABSTRACT

The national movement to reform education has paid little attention to the preparation and development of bilingual teachers. Recruitment and retention of bilingual teachers and the adoption of competencies and standards for bilingual teachers and teaching are two of the most important and pressing issues facing bilingual education in this country. This report discusses the desired elements for preservice and inservice bilingual teacher education. Analysis of data on teachers who have received bilingual training suggests that bilingually prepared teachers have been underutilized in the past. Recommendations made for preparation and training of bilingual teachers focus on four issues: (1) follow-up-transfer of competencies; (2) bilingual and second language teaching methodologies and multicultural education teaching strategies needed for all teachers; (3) assurance of opportunities for developing nonEnglish language fluency; and (4) training for aides to be more effective. Five recommendations are made which relate to areas where national leadership and support are needed: competencies and standards; national leadership and funding; dissemination of information; facilitation of earlier teacher preparation and career growth; and facilitation of recruitment and exchange of foreign trained teachers. (IAH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R Macias
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TOMÁS RIVERA CENTER *EXECUTIVE SUMMARY*

The National Need for Bilingual Teachers

by Reynaldo F. Macías

Fall 1989

ED334153

Educational Policy Environment

The national movement to reform education has paid much attention to teacher preparation and development in general, and to science and mathematics teacher shortages in particular. Little attention, however, has been paid to the preparation and development of bilingual teachers.

Several reports evaluating the state of schooling within the country have appeared recently. These reports focus on the quality and training of the teachers in schools, and the programs which prepared them to teach. The remedies, reforms and alterations they propose have ranged from doing better what is already being done, to "basic" or "fundamental" changes in the structures and programs of universities and colleges, and public schools. These national reports and polemics have influenced the way we talk about and define teacher preparation. Several different strategies are being pursued throughout the nation to improve the quality of instruction in the public schools:

- raise salaries in order to attract "better prepared teachers" -- the "get the brightest" strategy.
- move the education training to undergraduate, and even high school, for longer and earlier preparation -- the "get 'em early" strategy.
- add another professional year after the B.A. degree to better train them to teach -- the "keep 'em training longer" strategy.
- move away from the colleges and universities for the training and put this responsibility on the school districts -- the "get 'em before the colleges do" strategy.
- develop career ladders which distinguish amongst levels of teaching proficiency towards which teachers can aspire and work -- the "get 'em professionalized" strategy.
- bring in "content" experts to teach those subjects like math, science, and history -- the "let the experts teach" strategy.

These strategies, like the reports themselves, focus on structural relationships and not on the content of instruction, nor on the specific expertise needed by the teachers to teach effectively. For example, they have paid homage to some of the demographic changes in society, such as the increased need for teachers in the 1990's, while ignoring others, such as the racial and ethnic shifts in the schools enrollments. *A Nation at Risk* devoted a paragraph to the issue of language or equity. *A Nation Prepared* devoted 8 pages, while *Tomorrow's Teachers* only devoted 2 paragraphs to minority enrollments and the need for minority teachers. This inattention took place as school districts, especially in urban areas, saw their enrollments swell with limited English proficient (LEP) students.

National estimates of the number of these limited English proficient (LEP) students in public classrooms became politicized as the Reagan administrations attempted to reduce the scope and level of Federal bilingual programs. Federal efforts changed the definitions of students in need, and of the most effective instructional approaches, but did not define away the need for bilingual education and bilingual teachers. The absence of attention to this issue by educational reformers as they proposed solutions and programs for improving schools and teacher preparation exacerbated the situation.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The recruitment and retention of bilingual teachers, and the adoption of competencies and standards for bilingual teachers and teaching are two of the most important and pressing issues facing bilingual education in this country.

The Demand for Bilingual Teachers

Estimates of the demand for bilingual teachers depend heavily on the student to teacher ratio used. Given a low student to teacher ratio (20:1), the need for bilingual teachers of all languages, is projected to grow from 126,020 in 1976, to 170,000 in 2000.

Given a high ratio (35:1), the need for bilingual teachers is projected to grow from 72,010 in 1976 to 97,140 in the year 2000. The demand is greatest for bilingual teachers who can teach in Spanish and English. In 1976, bilingual teachers of English and Spanish represented 71% of the total need, and their proportion is projected to increase to 77% by the year 2000. While the need for bilingual teachers in all languages is projected to increase by 35% from 1976 to the year 2000, the need for Spanish-English bilingual teachers is projected to increase by 47% during the same time period (see Tables 1 & 2).

Supply of Bilingual Teachers

There were no current estimates of the national supply of bilingual teachers. However, we were able to study the factors that need to be taken into consideration in developing such estimates, particularly from earlier national studies of the language abilities of teachers.

There were approximately 2,266,000 teachers in 1980, 504,000 of whom had limited English proficient students in their classrooms. About 103,000 reported teaching English as a second language (ESL). Only 56,000 reported using a non-English language for instruction. Of these 56,000, only half had local or state bilingual certification, even though there were about 153,000 teachers in the nation (6.8% of the total teaching force) who had local or state bilingual certification. This means that there were approximately 28,000 teachers who had bilingual certification AND who were using a non-English language in the classroom. It also means that there were 125,000 bilingually certified teachers who were NOT using a non-English language in the classroom.

Any attempt at estimating the supply of bilingual teachers needs to take into account the preparation of teachers, their assignments to bilingual classrooms, and their retention.

Bilingual Teacher Preparation

Bilingual teacher preparation usually involves developing proficiency in the non-English language along with English, knowledge and demonstration of bilingual and English as a second language instructional methods, and knowledge of the history and culture of the students they are teaching. Although all of these competencies can be learned, the most difficult for monolingual English speakers is developing a professional degree of proficiency in the non-English language. For those native speakers of a non-English language, the most difficult competencies are developing a professional degree of literacy in the non-English language and systematically acquiring a wide range of bilingual and ESL instructional methods. Both of these are difficult because of the absence of good preparation and staff development programs in these areas.

Of the teachers surveyed in 1980, 96,000 teachers claimed proficiency in a non-English language, but had no preparation to teach bilingually (of these about 10,000 used the non-English language in the classroom). Another 39,000 teachers reported that they had proficiency in the non-

English language and "minimal" preparation to teach bilingually (including teaching the language arts of the non-English language and other subject areas in the non-English language). About 26,000 claimed they were proficient in the non-English language and had a "basic" preparation to teach bilingually (including teaching non-English language arts, teaching other subjects in the non-English language, study of the history and culture of the students they were teaching, and teaching English as a second language).

Despite the much larger number of bilingually certified teachers, less than a quarter had minimal preparation, while about 1 in 6 only had basic preparation.

Much of the training which takes place is directed at teachers in isolation from other instructional or administrative personnel. Yet, we know that this training is enhanced when complemented with training for administrators and school site staff for support and collaboration. It is also particularly important to embed this training within the context of school change. More than just the addition of instructional skills, this training of bilingual competencies involves a "paradigm shift" in teaching. Teachers must believe that language minority students can and will learn, and that the use of the non-English language is not un-American. If teachers resist the purposes of bilingual education, then this training is not useful, nor are the programs successful, nor do the students learn. This paradigm shift is especially critical in inservice training of currently employed teachers. No additional training overcomes a teacher's expectation that a child, or group of children, will not learn.

Recent research on effective staff development offers several findings:

- the most effective inservice teacher educators are other practicing teachers, or a peer coaching system of teachers, researchers, and trainers;
- training yields more positive results when the content of the training is given in small amounts over an extended period of time, than when presented as one intensive workshop;
- follow-up coaching should be systematically included to ensure transfer of training into the teacher's classroom.

Therefore, effective [bilingual] staff development should include:

- the study of the theoretical basis or the rationale of teaching methods;
- demonstrations of the methods by persons who are relatively expert in the model;
- practice and feedback in protected conditions to ensure teacher comfort and confidence; and
- peer coaching from one another at the school site to ensure continuous development and use of the new skills.

Several significant staff development programs for bilingual teachers drawing on these findings were found in California, New York and several other parts of the country. These findings are important because the type of training makes a difference in whether or not the teachers will use the training in their teaching.

Bilingual teaching and assignments

Being prepared to teach bilingually does not assure such assignments. Not all bilingual teaching takes place in an officially designated bilingual classroom and not all bilingual classrooms enjoy bilingual teaching. We know that we have under-utilized bilingually prepared teachers in the past.

In 1980-1981, less than a third of the minimally prepared bilingual teachers (11,000) used a non-English language in the classroom, while 22,000 teachers who met minimal standards were not using their

bilingual capability. Only about half of those with basic preparation (13,000) used the non-English language for instruction, while about 9,000 teachers met the standard for basic qualifications but were not teaching bilingually or teaching ESL in 1980-1981.

The reasons for this under-utilization appear to be many, ranging from hostile assignments on the part of discriminating school districts, to extra assignments for these teachers that resulted in their asking for a non-bilingual teaching assignment where they could use their bilingual abilities at their own discretion.

Also, in the 1970s and early 1980s, many of the first teachers who were trained and/or certified to teach bilingually very quickly were "promoted" out of the classroom, to resource teacher positions or administrative positions responsible for bilingual programs. This is taking place less and less as those positions are filled.

Recruitment and retention of bilingual teachers

The need for bilingual teachers and their short supply has given rise to additional competition between districts and states for these teachers.

A number of school districts have accepted the concept of pay differentials for specialist credential training. In some instances this involved additional pay for additional hours of work related to being a specialist teacher (additional prepapration time, assistance to other non-specialist teachers, etc.). This might be in the form of a stipend, or in the form of a percentage of the base salary. Other districts implemented a pay differential without the additional time or duties, but on the basis of additional training and expertise.

Another concern in teacher retention is the additional instructional and administrative burden placed on the few bilingual teachers such that they "burn out" more quickly than other teachers. Many then request being reassigned to a non-bilingual classroom, or leave teaching for administrative or non-education employment.

Regional concentration of bilingual teachers

In 1980, about one-third of the certified bilingual teachers were located in the 3 states of California, New York, and Texas. However, these 3 states also accounted for *half* of those bilingual teachers who had **minimal** preparation, and 62% of those with **basic** preparation. In addition, these 3 states had a much higher proportion of these teachers who actually used the non-English language in the classroom.

Credentialling and requirements for bilingual and language competencies vary tremendously between states. This limits the transferrability of specialist credentials across states and reflects the lack of agreement on the competencies required for effective language and language based teaching. Competencies and effective instructional practices need to be disseminated more widely.

Impact of Federally supported bilingual teacher training

Between 1976 and 1980, teachers who received preparation under the Federal Bilingual Education Act tended to be better prepared (two-thirds had basic preparation) than their counterparts with bilingual training not supported by the Act (only about one-third met basic preparation standards).

Teachers prepared in programs supported by the Bilingual Education Act were more often teaching bilingually (65% of those with basic preparation) than were other teachers who had similar preparation but in programs not supported by the Act (22%).

Teachers received basic (in all 4 areas) training and preparation outside of academic settings only when support was provided by the Bilingual Education Act.

Part of the reason these Title 7 trained bilingual teachers tended to be better prepared, actually teaching bilingually, and

stayed in teaching longer, was that the approach to the preparation was systematic and conceptually based, as compared to the training outside of these Federally supported programs. This conceptual basis improved for state guided preparation during the 1980s, but only in California did it mature into a state adopted theoretical framework.

Rate of increase in the supply of bilingual teachers

While the numbers of public school teachers increased by 3.8% between 1976 and 1980 (from 2,182,000 to 2,266,000), the number of teachers using a non-English language and/or teaching ESL increased by 32.3% (from 120,000 to 159,000); the number of teachers with non-English language ability and basic preparation increased 120% (from 11,000 to 24,000); and teachers with non-English language ability and minimal preparation increased 39.1% (from 23,000 to 32,000).

In the 4 years between 1976 and 1980, the satisfaction of the demand for bilingual teachers, went from 47% to 82% if you used a high student to teacher ratio, or from 27% to 47% if you used a low ratio. We don't have a good description of the distribution of these teachers by state or by level of schooling, or by language, particularly as it compared against the distribution of LEP students by state, level of schooling, and language. However, these results indicate that the rate and quality and commitment of teachers who are prepared to adequately teach bilingually **can** be reached to meet the demand created by the growing numbers of limited English proficient students.

Recommendations

Preparation and training

Follow-up-transfer of competencies. Whether bilingual teacher preparation takes place as pre-service or in-service education, we must assure transfer of the competencies to the classroom. The critical elements to assure this transfer are outlined above, with the one critical element of coaching.

Bilingual and second language teaching methodologies and multicultural education teaching strategies needed for all teachers. Most of the largest school districts within the nation have a majority of their enrollments being racial/ethnic minorities. The need for understanding individual and group differences is more critical today than at any time in our country's history. All teachers should have cross-cultural teaching strategies and competencies. Since much of the teacher student interaction in the classroom can be seen as a series of linguistic interactions, then understanding the communicative strategies of language based instruction can only improve the quality of teaching, by assuring comprehension and comprehensible instruction for all students.

Assure opportunities for developing non-English language fluency. Support for NDEA type international travel, professional growth plans, tax credits for professional growth incentives, with adequate and reasonable time periods for learning second languages for teaching purposes addresses the most difficult teacher preparation competency in this area. We need to capitalize as well, on the various non-English language resources within the nation, focussing on developing the literacy and teaching skills of the individuals who already have those language abilities.

Training for aides to be more effective. The need for concentrated preparation of instructional aides as paraprofessionals should include competencies in bilingual, second language instructional methodologies as well as general teaching methods, curriculum content, and team teaching strategies.

National leadership and support

Competencies and standards. Promotion of professional competencies and standards for bilingual teachers and teaching should be developed and adopted by the major national teacher professional organiza-

tions, particularly the National Association for Bilingual Education.

National leadership and funding. The success of Federal leadership in bilingual teacher training should be renewed and expanded. Training under the Bilingual Education Act for instructional personnel as well as the fellowship programs, and other bilingual personnel development programs should be reinstated and expanded.

Dissemination of information. Information dissemination should be supported and coordinated with national teacher and other educational organizations as well as the various information clearinghouses (e.g., National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, Educational Resources Information Clearing houses). This information dissemination should include effective language and language based instructional practices and their concomitant necessary teacher competencies, a promotion of effective staff development strategies, programs, and practices, credential/certificate/endorsement requirements and recommendations across states, and their resultant successes in the schools.

Facilitation of earlier teacher preparation and career growth. The recognition that teaching involves greater and earlier professional development as well as continued professional growth is an important perspective for guiding some of the government's activities. Undergraduate student loans, grants, loan forgiveness programs for teachers are some of these activities, but so are career growth tax credits and incentives.

Facilitate recruitment and exchange of foreign trained teachers. The federal government can facilitate the recredentialling of foreign trained teachers by identifying it as a critical profession for immigration, and by coordinating and facilitating teacher exchange programs with other national governments (credentialling for which is already available through some states).

This project was undertaken by Reynaldo F. Macías at the USC Center for Multilingual, Multicultural Research with a grant from the Exxon Education Foundation. Additional support and cooperation was provided by the Tomás Rivera Center (Claremont, CA). Additional copies of this executive summary, and the complete final report are available from the Tomás Rivera Center (714-625-6607).

Table 1
Projections of Bilingual Teacher Need, 1976-2000
for the Nation
(in 000's)

Year	Language	LEP Students 5-14	Bilingual Teacher Need Low (20:1)	Hi (35:1)
1976	Spanish	1,789.50	89.48	51.13
	Asian	125.90	6.30	3.60
	Other	605.00	30.25	17.29
	Total	2,520.40	126.02	72.01
1980	Spanish	1,727.60	86.38	49.36
	Asian	114.80	5.74	3.28
	Other	551.80	27.59	15.77
	Total	2,394.20	119.71	68.41
1985	Spanish	1,794.30	89.72	51.27
	Asian	111.20	5.56	3.18
	Other	539.40	26.97	15.41
	Total	2,439.90	122.00	69.71
1990	Spanish	2,092.70	104.64	59.79
	Asian	121.10	6.06	3.46
	Other	582.10	29.11	16.63
	Total	2,795.90	139.80	79.88
1995	Spanish	2,455.80	122.79	70.17
	Asian	132.70	6.64	3.79
	Other	638.00	31.90	18.23
	Total	3,226.60	161.30	92.19
2000	Spanish	2,630.00	131.50	75.14
	Asian	132.60	6.63	3.79
	Other	637.40	31.87	18.21
	Total	3,400.00	170.00	97.14

Table 2
Projections of Bilingual Teacher Need for CA, NY & TX, 1976-2000 (in 000's)

Year LANG	LEP CA	Bilingual Teachers (20:1)	(35:1)	LEP NY	Bilingual Teachers (20:1)	(35:1)	LEP TX	Bilingual Teachers (20:1)	(35:1)
1976									
Spanish	505.10	25.26	14.43	332.60	16.63	9.50	484.90	24.25	13.85
Asian	45.70	2.29	1.31	n/a	--	--	n/a	--	--
Other	59.10	2.96	1.69	107.80	5.39	3.08	21.30	1.07	0.61
Total	609.90	30.50	17.43	455.10	22.76	13.00	509.40	25.47	14.55
1980									
Spanish	485.50	24.28	13.87	305.50	15.28	8.73	499.50	24.98	14.27
Asian	41.50	2.08	1.19	n/a	--	--	n/a	--	--
Other	53.60	2.68	1.53	93.50	4.68	2.67	20.80	1.04	0.59
Total	580.60	29.03	16.59	411.60	20.58	11.76	523.30	26.17	14.95
1985									
Spanish	513.00	25.65	14.66	297.80	14.89	8.51	547.40	27.37	15.64
Asian	40.90	2.05	1.17	n/a	--	--	n/a	--	--
Other	52.90	2.65	1.51	84.90	4.25	2.43	21.20	1.06	0.61
Total	606.80	30.34	17.34	394.20	19.71	11.26	571.80	28.59	16.34
1990									
Spanish	608.90	30.45	17.40	339.90	17.00	9.71	642.60	32.13	18.36
Asian	45.40	2.27	1.30	n/a	--	--	n/a	--	--
Other	58.60	2.93	1.67	90.50	4.53	2.59	23.30	1.17	0.67
Total	712.90	35.65	20.37	442.60	22.13	12.65	669.40	33.47	19.13
1995									
Spanish	723.60	36.18	20.67	392.60	19.63	11.22	759.90	38.00	21.71
Asian	50.40	2.52	1.44	n/a	--	--	n/a	--	--
Other	65.10	3.26	1.86	97.60	4.88	2.79	25.70	1.29	0.73
Total	839.00	41.95	23.97	503.40	25.17	14.38	789.50	39.48	22.56
2000									
Spanish	785.60	39.28	22.45	416.70	20.84	11.91	823.60	41.18	23.53
Asian	51.00	2.55	1.46	n/a	--	--	n/a	--	--
Other	65.90	3.30	1.88	96.60	4.83	2.76	26.00	1.30	0.74
Total	902.50	45.13	25.79	526.40	26.32	15.04	853.50	42.68	24.39

Note: Figures with "--" or "n/a" are not projected due to small sample size, but they are included in state totals.